UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



Joel Aaron Silberman,)
Plaintiff,)
v.	Assigned To: Unassigned Assign. Date: 12/29/2016
Vincent H. Cohen, Jr.,	Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil
Defendant.)
)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* form "Complaint for Violation of Civil Rights," which is accompanied by an application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) (requiring dismissal of a case upon a determination that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted).

Pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires complaints to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); see Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff sues former acting United States Attorney Vincent Cohen, Jr., in his official

capacity. Plaintiff describes this action as "a petition for habus [sic] corpus and discovery and also

[a] dismissal and review of [his] case," which presumably is pending in the Superior Court of the

District of Columbia. Compl. at 5; see Silberman v. Berk, No. 16-cv-2386 (D.D.C. Dec. 7, 2016)

(dismissing under Younger abstention doctrine plaintiff's action to compel dismissal of criminal

cases pending in Superior Court).

Plaintiff has presented no grounds to consider under the habeas statute. See Mayle v. Felix,

545 U.S. 644, 649 (2005) (noting that "Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Cases

requires a more detailed statement [than Rule 8(a)]. The habeas rule instructs the petitioner to

'specify all the grounds for relief available to [him]' and to 'state the facts supporting each

ground."") (second alteration in original). And this court lacks jurisdiction to review the decisions

of other courts, including those of the D.C. Superior Court. See United States v. Choi, 818 F. Supp.

2d 79, 85 (D.D.C. 2011) (district courts "generally lack[] appellate jurisdiction over other judicial

bodies, and cannot exercise appellate mandamus over other courts") (citing Lewis v. Green, 629

F. Supp. 546, 553 (D.D.C. 1986)); Fleming v. United States, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994),

cert. denied 513 U.S. 1150 (1995) ("Until the Supreme Court of the United States says otherwise,

... [t]his Court does not have jurisdiction to review the decision of a state ... court.") (applying

District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462 (1983); Rooker v. Fidelity Trust

Co., 263 U.S. 413 (1923)). A separate order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: December 22, 2016

United States District Judge

2